

Andrzej Kozina

Negotiations within Firm-Idea

Zarządzanie Publiczne nr 42 (4), 53-62

2017

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Andrzej Kozina

Negotiations within Firm-Idea

In a Firm-Idea company, a specific institutional model of organisation and performance, and all kinds of processes, including negotiations, are conducted differently than in a traditional company. Therefore, the objective of the paper is to characterise negotiation processes pursued in Firm-Idea companies through a comparative analysis of the literature and the author's original ideas. Specific features of idea-negotiations are distinguished based on typical, general concepts of negotiations. Their three substantial dimensions are described, i.e. values, relations and cooperation. In effect, the paper offers a comprehensive description of negotiations viewed as an efficient tool useful in different types of processes in Firm-Idea companies.

Keywords: (business) negotiations, Firm-Idea company, idea-negotiations

The objective of the paper is to characterise negotiation processes in a specific type of organisation, the so-called "Firm-Idea" company, a specific concept (model) of contemporary corporate performance based on a new approach to values in business (Hausner, Zmysłony 2015). The paper is theoretical and methodological in nature since it focuses on developing the author's concept of such negotiations, subsequently named shortly "idea-negotiations". Although the authors of the discussed corporate model did not distinguish negotiations as one of substantial processes within that model, it seems that such a process in a sense occurs in the context of other activities and determines their effective performance.

The features of idea-negotiations have been distinguished on the basis of general major interpretations of negotiations, a comparative analysis of the literature and the works in which a synthesis of those interpretations was provided (Lewicki et al. 2005; Kozina 2012). Those interpretations are presented in the next part of the paper. Then,

in its three subsequent parts, the three key dimensions of idea-negotiations are characterised, i.e. values, relationships and cooperation. In the closing section, the concept is summarised and the directions of further research are outlined.¹

The Firm-Idea company as a negotiating party and the environment

On the one hand, negotiations in all kinds of organisations, also in Firm-Idea companies, emerge from their nature of a particular type of a social group accomplishing specific objectives. Therefore, we should examine both the negotiations for which a firm constitutes their environment and those in which it participates, because negotiations may be conducted either between the firm's internal stakeholders, e.g. employers and employees, owners and managers, etc., or by its representatives with external partners, e.g. suppliers, clients, contractors and so on. Negotiations constitute an efficient tool for managing an organisation, in particular for

Andrzej Kozina
Department of Public Administration
Cracow University of Economics
ul. Rakowicka 27
37-510 Kraków
kozinaa@uek.krakow.pl

¹ The publication was financed from the resources allocated to the Faculty of Public Economy and Administration, Cracow University of Economics, under the grant for the maintenance of the research potential.

cooperation and conflict resolution in all ventures focused on increasing effectiveness of operation.

On the other hand, Firm-Idea companies are organisations of a special character, therefore the features of both their internal and external negotiation processes are unique, different from other negotiations typical for traditional organisations. Therefore, the general concept of the Firm-Idea company should be presented and its substantial features identified as determinants of negotiations conducted by it based on the work of the concept's authors (Hausner, Zmysłony 2015).

It could be said that the Firm-Idea company is a very specific business concept, in other words, an organisational model, based on the two fundamental assumptions:

1. Human behaviours, including business ones, have a cultural foundation. In that sense, economy is also a culture, i.e. an area of axiologically saturated communication and cooperation.
2. The meaning of a particular activity cannot be extracted from the activity itself, but may be expressed by the development trajectory of the entity undertaking that activity, no matter whether it is an individual or an organisation, also a business one. In order to make the company's activities sensible, the company must have its own idea, a system of values stemming from its "life trajectory", which determines its future directions of operation (Hausner, Zmysłony 2015).

From the perspective of negotiations, the emphasis on communication, cooperation and values is a very important issue within the above presented assumptions.

Assuming that a broader description of the Firm-Idea concept is not required, being described thoroughly in the cited source, it is only necessary to present its substantial features, crucial from the point of view of negotiations conducted in accordance with this concept (Biga 2017).

1. Co-generation of values.
2. Use of market mechanisms.
3. Focus on relationships.
4. Values seen from a dual perspective: the firm as an institution and the firm as an organisation.
5. Economy as a culture.

6. Negation of the opportunistic market game.
7. Departure from quarterly capitalism.
8. Key role of soft capitals.
9. Development spiral.
10. Non-commercialisation of all symptoms of human activity.

An analysis of these features shows that the organisational model in question has typical attributes of business organisations, while reducing the negative phenomena that occur in such organisations. As it is aptly stressed by the authors of the discussed concept, the essential question is whether breaking the ties between the market and the values is inevitable and is caused by the nature of the market or whether it is consequence of a particular, capitalistic model of market-oriented economy in which there are no limits for the commercialisation of goods (Hausner, Zmysłony 2015). Intangible assets in particular are very important from the point of view of negotiations as an essential object of consideration since they both demonstrate the crucial role of values, and stress the significance of relationships, both internal and external.

Based on the statements and interpretations of negotiations presented above, it is possible to extract their features typical of Firm-Idea companies.

Specific features of idea-negotiations

Defining negotiations will help to identify their universal features and determine their characteristics specific for the area of interest, i.e. the negotiation processes in Firm-Idea companies. In the literature, negotiations are usually interpreted as a process, a method of managing conflict and reaching agreement, as interdependence between the parties involved and as decision making, communicating, exchanging and creating values (Lewicki et al. 2005; Kozina 2012). Most important is the concept of negotiations understood as an interactive decision-making process, because such a concept is closest to the nature of an organisation as both a specific negotiation environment and a party involved in the negotiation process.

The above interpretations of the analysed notion were related to the specific nature of idea-

Table 1. Interpretations and features of idea-negotiations

Interpretations	Sample definitions	Features of idea-negotiations
Process – a complex activity spread over time, comprising a chain of subprocesses, phases (stages) and detailed actions, accomplished in a sequence, parallel and/or periodically. The most general and common way of defining negotiations.	Negotiation is a process, not a unitary skill (Fowler 2001). Most of the definitions are listed below. Negotiation process as a whole comprises three partial processes: planning – providing conditions for negotiations; conducting – reaching agreement; summation – making a deal and evaluating negotiations.	The Firm-Idea concept does not deal directly with process management. In the structure appropriate for such a firm, organisations do not tend to formalise their processes. It is a structure with great flexibility and ability to self-organise, based on teamwork, direct and multidirectional coordination. All types of processes, including negotiations, are varied and performed spontaneously, reflexively, in those areas where problems requiring the application of an adequate process arise. In each type of organisation, also in Firm-Idea companies, negotiation processes are ancillary in nature. At the same time, negotiations do not tend to be structured easily due to their nature. It is rather difficult to programme and formalise them via procedures. The models of negotiations are usually too simplified.
Method (way, form, mean) of managing conflict between the parties (resolving it), aimed at achieving their own goals and obtaining the best results. Searching for the solutions to one or more divergent issues (competitive dimension of negotiations).	Negotiations are a subset of social relationships comprising conflict solving (Rubin, Brown 1975). The sequence of mutual moves throughout which the parties aim to achieve a profitable solution to a partial conflict of interests (Nęcki 2002). Conflict is simply a condition or a reason for negotiation (Kennedy 1998).	In Firm-Idea companies, as in all organisations, numerous and various conflicts occur between the stakeholders as a result of a great deal of interactions among them. The parties have divergent goals and different opinions on particular issues included in the scope of the negotiations. Contradictions also apply to values, principles, expectations, ideas, etc., which form the emotional context of the negotiations, requiring identification because of their considerable impact on substantive issues. Conflicts are resolved on a regular basis, at the moment they occur, with their respective parties being responsible for managing them. The positive features of conflicts are highlighted, especially their motivational role and the stimulation of changes that improve organisational performance.
Method of reaching agreement – considers the intended result of negotiations profitable for their parties, i.e. satisfying their needs. That interpretation is the necessary “logical supplement” to the previous interpretation, exposing divergent interests (cooperative dimension of negotiations).	The underlying factor for all negotiations is striving to ensure mutual gains, i.e. reaching an agreement which is more beneficial than the lack of it (Samuelson, Marks 1998). Negotiations are the communication process of the parties when they expect that an agreement may provide greater benefits than acting without it (Dąbrowski 1991).	The participants in idea-negotiations also have common goals, of a fundamental character, expressed as mutual striving for the success and development of an organisation. By definition, the parties are interested in the effects (either material or non-material) of the actions which are important for them, and their interaction is necessary to achieve the desired level of organisational effectiveness. This, in turn, requires making appropriate (implicit and explicit) contracts expressing the terms and principles of cooperation. The conflict resolution process discussed above is used to reach an agreement. In addition, there is a need for coordination between the teams, based on strong leadership.
Mutual dependence of the parties – the interaction of the cooperative and competitive dimensions, i.e. coexistence of shared and contradictory objectives of the parties. None of them can achieve their goals on their own and simultaneously each of them can help the other ones to accomplish their goals.	Negotiations are deliberate interactions of two or more complex social units which attempt to define or redefine the terms of their interdependence (Walton, McKersie 1965). It is a reciprocal communication process to reach an agreement when you and the other party have certain interests, some of which are shared and some conflicting (Fisher, Ury, Patton 2000).	Interactions between the Firm-Idea company stakeholders are generally positive, but at the same time numerous, multifaceted, symmetric and asymmetric, stronger and weaker, incidental and regular, etc. Therefore, they are difficult to be identified and established. In terms of internal dependencies and interactions with the environment, a Firm-Idea company strives to develop and maintain partnerships based on mutual trust and benefits for all the parties. Thus, the discussed interpretation of idea-negotiations expresses the desire of the partners to achieve a mutually profitable result, which is conditioned by the need to resolve the conflict between them.

Table 1 – continued

Interpretations	Sample definitions	Features of idea-negotiations
Interactive decision-making process – at first the parties independently formulate alternative solutions to the discussed issues and the criteria for the evaluation of those solutions. Then the parties agree on the solutions and criteria, reaching a joint decision.	Negotiations are a process in which opposing positions are combined in a joint decision (Zartman 1994). An interpersonal decision-making process by which two or more people agree how to allocate scarce resources (Thompson 2001)	Due to a high degree of integration of the elements of Firm-Idea companies and numerous interactions between them, many decision-making problems of varying importance are solved in negotiations. When formulating solutions to problems, those options are considered that will make it possible to reach the shared and individual goals of the stakeholders to the greatest possible extent. The values shared by them are the basis for formulating assessment criteria for the analysed options. Decision making is decentralised, implemented in problem areas by managers and internal experts.
Communication process – reciprocal exchange of information, “penetrating” the negotiation process, i.e. all the parties’ activities, from initial presentation of their positions, throughout trading offers, persuading one another, clarifying objections, etc., to making the final deal and drafting the contract.	Negotiations depend on communication (Nierenberg 1994). Reciprocal communication process, specified in the aforementioned definitions (Dąbrowski 1991; Fisher, Ury, Patton 2000).	In Firm-Idea companies, all employees have unlimited, real-time access to all information. Transparency of communication allows everybody to suggest how better to achieve the goals of the organisation. The data necessary for carrying out the activities are open and available to everyone. In the negotiation planning process, information must be gathered on important dimensions and parameters of the negotiations, i.e. partners, scope and context (defined by the specific nature of activities, processes and projects associated with the negotiations) and the environment. In the negotiation process, typical forms of communication are used, i.e. offers, questions and answers, arguments and counterarguments. The evaluation of the negotiations takes into account the data necessary to conclude the contract (in terms of particular issues) and assess the entire process in terms of effects, tools, relationships and the process itself.
Process of mutual exchange – considers either material or non-material values on the agreed terms. That interpretation is closely related to the previous one, because communication process constitutes the form of trading both information itself and data on the resources.	Negotiation is the primary way to get from others what we want (Fisher, Ury, Patton 2000). This is a tool by which we seek conditions for getting what we want from someone who wants something from us, whereas the exchange itself is a way of making decisions through negotiation (Kennedy 1998).	Although the Firm-Idea concept does not directly address the issue of exchange, based on other characteristics of such organisations the following theses can be formulated. The exchange between the negotiating parties pertains to all kinds of negotiating issues and focuses on allocating (reallocating) the shared resources. Such exchange encompasses all types of resources and, by definition, it should be equivalent, which can be achieved by mutual agreement and adequate concessions. It is driven by the differences in the hierarchy of goals of the parties, i.e. one party seeks to acquire significant resources and values, giving in return resources or values which are less important for it but significant for the other party. The exchange covers tangible and intangible resources, i.e. ideas and concepts.
The process of creating common values – interdependence between the parties – and the process of mutual exchange in negotiations allow the parties to reach common benefits, which would not be possible without negotiations. This the rationale for the two previous interpretations of negotiations.	Negotiations are conducted for two reasons: to create something new that neither party would be able to do itself, or to solve a problem or dispute which causes the discrepancy between the parties (Lewicki et al. 2005). Value creation in the negotiation process is possible when one party has something to offer that is not very worthwhile for that party, but represents a great value for the other party – and vice versa (Samuelson, Marks 1998).	Creating values in idea-negotiations is their most important aspect, expressed mainly by creating model (standard) solutions concerning the performed activities. The values are based on accepted and shared social norms and a management philosophy that shapes the partners’ relationships. This helps to multiply the relational capital (both internal and external), and to consolidate the image of an organisation that takes care of the relationships with employees and their well-being. In effect, the sense of justice and partnership is strengthened. Common values developed through negotiations represent a synergic effect of the parties’ interaction. They are distinct values translated into direct and basic principles of acceptable and unacceptable employee behaviours.

Source: author’s own elaboration based on (Lewicki et al. 2005, Kozina 2012, Rządca 2003).

negotiations and put in a sequence according to their logical implications, first presenting the statements reflecting the essence of every interpretation, then quoting sample definitions and, finally, characterising each interpretation in the context of idea-negotiations (Table 1).

It can be easily seen from Table 1 that, just as in every kind of socio-economic negotiations, idea-negotiations are complex and multidimensional. Their peculiarity lies in the fact that their features distinguished on the basis of the definitions of negotiations presented in Table 1-take on a specific form that is adequate to the essence and nature of Firm-Idea companies. This is expressed primarily by the occurrence of three important dimensions in idea-negotiations: values, relationships and interactions. They are, therefore, an extension of the concept of idea-negotiations. Those three dimensions are described below.

The value dimension of idea-negotiations

As mentioned above, one of the crucial aspects of interpreting negotiations is treating them as a value creating process. By exchanging values, each party loses a little but gains a lot. This is possible thanks to the differences in value assessment that can, as a source of added value, concern interests, opinions, risk tolerance and time preference (Lax, Sebenius 1986).

Creating value by negotiations means accepting the arrangements that make an agreement more beneficial for the parties than the division of resources which are at the negotiators' disposal. Professional negotiators often try to increase the benefit package that the parties have to share among themselves by discovering potential additional benefits that the expected agreement can bring to the parties. As a result, the sum of the pieces of the proverbial cake which they take away from the negotiating table is greater than the cake placed on the table at the start of the conversation. This is what the value creation process is about in negotiations (Stanek 2016).

The quoted author distinguished the following means whereby that process is performed:

1. Common interests.
2. Reducing operational costs.
3. Reducing problems with the completion of assignments.
4. Diverse priorities.
5. Different expectations concerning timeframes.
6. Diverse predictions.
7. Different levels of risk tolerance.
8. Varied possibilities.

The analysed dimension of idea-negotiations is also reflected in the classic concept related to negotiations, the so-called "added-value negotiating" (Albrecht, Albrecht 1993). The ground rules to keep in mind as you use that concept are as follows:

1. Never make just one offer, always propose at least two deals, preferably more.
2. Listen carefully, understand the other party's interest clearly.
3. Do not personalise or emotionalise the process.
4. Take confidence in your veto power, you can always say no.
5. Trust the process, beware of shortcuts.
6. Do not expect perfect results every time. Some negotiating sessions will go more smoothly than others.
7. Model openness and compliance and act as if you expected the other party to do the same.
8. No piecemeal negotiating, work from the big picture, not one item at a time.
9. No power ploys, dirty tricks or other manipulative traps or tactics.
10. No cherry-picking – each deal stands or falls on its own merits. Do not allow the other party to pick the best parts from all the deals in order to make a new one.

The added-value negotiating method itself comprises the following steps (Albrecht, Albrecht 1993):

1. Clarify interests.
2. Identify options.
3. Design deal packages.
4. Select the best deal.
5. Perfect the deal.

The relational dimension of idea-negotiations

In a broad sense, the notion of relations between the negotiating parties, i.e. the organisation and its external stakeholders (or their representatives),

means all kinds of interactions, relationships, dependences, connections, etc., between the parties. However, it is expedient to narrow the notion under consideration to those relationships that are relevant for the attainment of the objectives of specific negotiations. These are

Table 2. Major principles of strategic partnership in negotiations

Name of principle	Characteristics of recommended procedure
Reciprocity	All partners respond favourably to positive reactions and actions of others. They avoid negative moves, referring to the similarity of situations in which they are together, according to the old saying “do not do to another person what is not pleasant to you”. They help one another to perform their activities, particularly in difficult or crisis situations, especially in relations with other stakeholders, to strengthen their bargaining power and credibility e.g. by supporting offers, lending loans, ensuring guarantees, securing contracts, providing references, etc. The partners broadly perceive their roles in synergy and going beyond limited, detailed goals of particular negotiations.
Equilibrium (complementarity and separation)	On the one hand, two important issues, i.e. substantive problem solving and establishing mutual relations, favourably impact each other. They ensure positive feedback throughout the negotiation process. On the other hand, both issues need to be viewed separately since the effective solution to one should not have a negative impact on the other. It is unacceptable to reach an unfavourable agreement in order to maintain a positive relationship with the partner or to damage the mutual relationship by seeking immediate benefits at the partner's expense.
Strategic orientation (prospective-ness and continuity)	Individual negotiations should only be a stage of long-term cooperation or strategic partnership based on mutual trust. While setting the objectives of specific negotiations, more general goals of the company stemming from its vision and mission statements should be kept in mind as an important point of reference. It may happen that in a given negotiating situation the desired profits are not obtained, or even a substantial loss is suffered. However, at the same time the organisation establishes or develops a beneficial relationship with its partner that can bring significant profits in the future, significantly outweighing the loss suffered in the short term.
Selectivity	Companies should shape positive relationships only with selected partners. In this case, stakeholder analysis is helpful in identifying which relationships are important to the organisation. In addition, hastily setting too many and/or unrestricted relationships can expose the organisation to the risk of squandering its resources.
Credibility	This principle is based on mutual trust. The strategic partners do not commit unlawful or unethical actions against themselves, including the so-called half-truths or selectivity in communication. They are honest, truthful and predictable. They do not fail. They know what they can expect and they do not surprise one another in the negative sense of this word.
Openness and symmetry of information	There are no communication barriers between the negotiation partners. All the relevant data flows freely and without limitation. The information exchanged is authentic, reliable (from proven sources), delivered in a timely manner and in the right amount and quality to the right recipients. The communication channels are sufficiently expensive. There are no delays, gaps or falsifications of data. Partners are “well informed” and safe as far as information is concerned.
Flexibility	Offering many opportunities for beneficial solutions to the negotiation partners. They should be adequate for the conditions of operation and cooperation so that, in the event of a possible failure to establish a favourable relationship with one partner, the opportunity to win other allies could be created. A fair and comprehensive analysis of the negotiating situation should, therefore, be carried out in a broad context, especially in the conditions of the market which require a substantial negotiating experience.
Support	Mutual support of the partners in establishing and maintaining a good relationship with other stakeholders so as to create networks of collaborating organisations. There should be similar support activities as with the principle of reciprocity in order to win new associates or even allies for our present partner. Strategic partnership should ensure a kind of “transitivity” through the mutual “attraction” of the partners with the ability to cooperate, conclude coalitions, create alliances, and with expertise in this area. Trusted strategic partners are simply more attractive and credible to others.

Source: author's own elaboration.

mainly positive relationships aimed to foster an agreement. In practice, such relationships are developed and perpetuated by common experiences arising from such negotiations, many effects of which are usually viewed by their parties as mutually beneficial. These relations may even have the nature of a very close partnership in a strategic dimension based on mutual trust (Ertel 2005; Greenhalgh 2001). Their presence makes it much easier for representatives of an organisation to engage in further negotiations with the partners with whom they interact in such a way.

In all types of negotiations in a company, a major problem appears, already addressed in the classical work (Walton, McKersie 1965) and termed “attitudinal structuring”. It refers to the need to take into account two kinds of issues: a given transaction and the existing and future relationships with the partner. It occurs because the significance of good relationships changes the way people behave while trying to start negotiations. The main reasons for the importance of those relationships are the expectations of future transactions of a significant value and of reciprocity from the other party as well as the fact that good relationships generate mutual trust. All negotiations should, therefore, be viewed from the point of view of both issues, i.e. substantive and relational ones. They should be considered as related and disconnected at the same time (Ertel 2005). In addition, it is necessary to assess the relevance of both issues from the point of view of the objectives of an organisation as a whole and of the particular task, project, process, etc., that the negotiation serves. The most important principles of establishing partnership in negotiations are described in Table 2.

It seems that all the principles outlined in Table 2 are very important, and it is not possible or expedient to establish their hierarchy. In practice, however, they may differ in the degree of difficulty during implementation. It must be stressed that the application of these principles is not easy and requires a great deal of perseverance and consistency. It is important not only to establish partnership relationships but also to sustain them. This is not a singular event, but

a long-lasting, complex process which involves a series of activities that consolidate the mutually beneficial and lasting relationships. It should also be added that mutual relations between the partners are important in the entire negotiating process. In the planning subprocess, they are the basis for analysing the bargaining power of the parties, setting the objectives and inventing the negotiation strategies. In the subprocess of conducting negotiations, establishing and developing the relationships take place, either positive or negative ones. Finally, those relations are one of the important dimensions of evaluating the negotiation process, especially when defining its criteria.

The cooperative dimension of idea-negotiations

The third key dimension of idea-negotiations is the application of a strategy or negotiation style aimed at seeking mutual benefits for their parties through their effective co-operation, while simultaneously rejecting competition concerning the perception of a given situation and the negotiators’ activities. Examples of such concepts of conducting negotiations which are relevant to the Firm-Idea concept are summarised in Table 3.

It should be emphasised that, in the negotiation practice, we often deal with mixed, intermediate tools, i.e. negotiation strategies and styles that balance the continuum between cooperation and competition. It is often difficult to foresee all the important determinants of effective negotiating tools.

Moreover, it should be added that the application of a negotiation strategy or style of cooperation is a necessary prerequisite, yet insufficient to succeed in negotiations. There is no certainty as to how the other party (or other parties) will behave. A sufficient condition for effective cooperation is the common desire of the parties to achieve mutually beneficial solutions to the problems in question.

Table 3. General concepts of negotiations focused on cooperation

Classic cooperative strategy (Kozina 2012)	Principled negotiation style (Fisher, Ury, Patton 2000)	Collaborating (as conflict resolution strategy) (Thomas 1976)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants – sole partners. 2. Interests and objective – not conflicting (common, compatible) or different (separate) of diverse hierarchy, interdependent and focused on agreement. 3. Resources – unlimited (changeable), can be increased by seeking new, creative solutions. 4. Relations – mutual trust of the parties, depending on long-lasting, positive interactions. 5. Motives – aimed at maximising mutual gains; focus is placed on interests. 6. Effects – win/win – satisfaction of all the parties, the condition for the implementation of the final deal is the mutual agreement of the parties, although difficult to reach. 7. Process – creative problem solving by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – identifying the interests of the parties (informing about one’s needs and interests), – problem structuring adequate for the parties’ interests, – creating options to solve arising problems, – selecting the criteria to evaluate those options, – formulating variants of the agreement, – reaching an agreement by the selecting the best option and improving it. 8. Technicalities – integrative (cooperative) ones, constructive and creative actions based on mutual trust and open exchange of information. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants are problem solvers. 2. The goal is a sensible outcome reached efficiently and amicably. 3. Separate the people from the problem. 4. Be soft on the people and hard on the problem. 5. Proceed independently of trust. 6. Focus on interests, not on positions. 7. Explore interests. 8. Avoid having a bottom line. 9. Invent options for mutual gain. 10. Develop multiple options to choose from (decide later). 11. Insist on using objective criteria. 12. Try to reach a result based on standards independent of will. 13. Reason and be open to reason. 14. Yield to principle, not to pressure. 	<p>Each of the parties accepts the goals of the others and the partners work together to achieve the same goals, solving the problems that may arise. It is a strategy of seeking solutions acceptable to all the sides of the conflict. Through direct and open communication and exchange of views, an alternative solution integrating all the parties is developed, and is better than their original propositions. Such a course of action helps the partners to focus on solving a common problem rather than defeating the opponent. This method favours determined, collective undertakings rather than aggressive actions. Both differences and similarities can be presented in a calm, uncompromising atmosphere. The agreement to be reached is a consensus, defined as a common position accomplished by a cooperative group of people of different views, under the conditions that allow everyone to influence the decisions. Such an agreement does not necessarily have to be unanimous because the ideal is too difficult to achieve. Differences of opinion are a source of valuable information, help clarify problems and force the parties to seek better solutions. It is also the most difficult method of resolving conflicts, which requires considerable interpersonal skills and a skilful use of the time factor. In the process of resolving conflicts by using this strategy, it is necessary to permanently and patiently explain the shared and divergent goals of the parties, the obstacles that impede their implementation and the causes of the conflicts, as well as their potential consequences. It is also necessary to creatively generate possible solutions to conflicts and to choose the options that will satisfy all of the participants. Detailed rules and procedures should be developed to ensure that these activities are carried out effectively.</p>

Source: author’s own elaboration.

Summary

In summary, it should be stressed that the proposed concept of idea-negotiations, taking into account three important dimensions, i.e. values, relationships and cooperation, can be used as a useful tool for managing Firm-Idea

companies, especially for identifying, analysing and implementing negotiating processes necessary to achieve their goals. Moreover, the proposed concept may contribute to the creation of a specific “negotiation management model” in Firm-Idea companies, and indirectly to the concretisation of the general concept of such an organisation.

It is also worth summarising the specific features of the idea-negotiations. First of all, many varied negotiation processes occur in a Firm-Idea company, although their formalisation is not necessary, let alone possible. There is an immediate and spontaneous need for conflicts to be resolved directly, and independently, in the places where they arise by the involved parties, possibly assisted by internal mediators. Moreover, a sort of spontaneous, natural desire to communicate effectively in the event of any disputes may be observed. In addition, mutual relationships between the negotiating parties are characterised by spontaneity, directness and partnership, both internal and external. Decision making in negotiations is situational and is carried out by each participant as experts and internal decision makers. This is accompanied by unlimited, multidirectional and open exchange of information and direct and multilateral communication during negotiations as well as by the universality and equivalence of mutual exchange, both material and non-material. Finally, the key values in the negotiation processes play a fundamental value, and are shared and co-created by all the employees.

On the other hand, it should be emphasised that the discussed concept is only a preliminary presentation of the concept of idea-negotiations, with further research being planned by the author. It is also necessary to compare methods of identification and analysis of idea-negotiations, both new and borrowed from other areas of management sciences. Comparative empirical research is also planned in Firm-Idea organisations in order to test the concept in practice.

References

- Albrecht, K., Albrecht, S. (1993). *Added Value Negotiating. The Breakthrough Method for Building Balanced Deals*. Homewood: Business One, Irwin.
- Biga B. (2017). *Firma-Idea. Nowe podejście do wartości w biznesie – wprowadzenie do debaty na ten temat*. Zakopane: 45 Sympozjum GAP (unpublished presentation).
- Dąbrowski, P.J. (1991). *Praktyczna teoria negocjacji*. Warsaw: Sorbog.
- Ertel, D. (2005). *Negocjacje jako źródło przewagi konkurencyjnej*. In *Negocjacje i rozwiązywanie konfliktów*. Gliwice: Wydawnictwo Helion.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., Patton, B. (2000). *Dochodząc do TAK. Negocjowanie bez poddawania się*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Fowler, A. (2001). *Jak skutecznie negocjować*. Warsaw: Petit.
- Greenhalgh, L. (2001). *Managing Strategic Relationships: The Key to Business Success*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hausner, J., Zmysłony, M. (2015). *Firma-Idea. Nowe podejście do wartości w biznesie*. Sopot: Agencja Artystyczna GAP.
- Kennedy, G. (1998). *Negocjator*. Warsaw: Studio EMKA.
- Kozina, A. (2012). *Planowanie negocjacji w przedsiębiorstwie*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego w Krakowie.
- Lax, D.A., Sebenius, J.K. (1986). *The Manager As Negotiator. Bargaining for Cooperation and Competitive Gain*. New York: The Free Press.
- Lewicki, R.J., Saunders, D.M., Barry, B., Minton, J.W. (2005). *Zasady negocjacji. Kompendium wiedzy dla trenerów i menedżerów*. Poznań: Dom Wydawniczy Rebis.
- Negocjacje. Harvard Business Essentials* (2005). Konstancin-Jeziorna: MT Biznes Ltd.
- Nęcki, Z. (2000). *Negocjacje w biznesie*. Kraków: Antykwa.
- Nierenberg, G.I. (1994). *Sztuka negocjacji jako metoda osiągnięcia celu*. Warsaw: Studio EMKA.
- Rubin, J., Brown, B. (1975). *The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Samuelson, W.F., Marks, S.G. (1998). *Ekonomia menedżerska*. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Stanek, I. (2016), *8 sposobów tworzenia wartości w negocjacjach (także w sporze)*. Retrieved from: <http://www.igorstanek.pl/2016/8-sposobow-tworzenia-wartosci-w-negocjacjach-takze-w-sporze/>.
- Thomas, K.W. (1976). *Conflict and Conflict Management*. In *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, M.D. Dunette (ed.), Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Thompson, L.L. (2001). *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.
- Walton, R.E., McKersie, R.B. (1965). *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social*

Interaction System. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Zartman, W.I. (ed.) (1994). *International Multilateral Negotiation. Approaches to the Management of Complexity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Negocjacje w Firmie-Idei

W Firmie-Idei jako specyficznym modelu organizacji i funkcjonowania instytucji wszelkiego rodzaju procesy, także negocjacyjne są realizowane w odmienny sposób niż w tradycyjnej firmie. Celem artykułu jest zatem scharakteryzowanie procesów negocjacyjnych realizowanych w Firmie-Idei. Dla realizacji tego celu wykorzystano analizę porównawczą literatury przedmiotu oraz oryginalne koncepcje autora. Wyodrębniono specyficzne cechy idea-negocjacji, opierając się na typowych, ogólnych interpretacjach pojęcia negocjacji. Opisano ich trzy zasadnicze wymiary, tj. wartości, relacje i współdziałanie. W efekcie uzyskano ich wszechstronny opis jako skutecznych narzędzi przydatnych do realizacji różnego typu procesów w Firmie-Idei.

Słowa kluczowe: negocjacje (gospodarcze), Firma-Idea, idea-negocjacje